

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

Regarding the § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) for being anticipated by Onozawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,296). Onozawa specifically requires a first S-shaped capacitor 8 and a second S-shaped capacitor 10. The first S-shaped capacitor 8 is in series with the horizontal deflection coil 7 (see Figures 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14 and 15 of Onozawa). The second S-shaped capacitor 10 is in series with the modulation coil 9. The modulation coil 9 is also connected to a pulse width control output circuit 81. The second S-shaped capacitor 10 is connected between the modulation coil 9 and the pulse width output circuit 81. There is no teaching or suggestion in Onozawa to exclude the S-shaped capacitor 10 from the circuitry.

Applicant submits that the S-shaped capacitors 8 and 10 in Onozawa are referred to as trace capacitors in the present application. As shown in Figure 1 of the present application, there is a trace capacitor in series with the deflection coil L1, but, there is no trace capacitor in series with inductor L2 or connected between inductor L2 and the current control circuit 2. This is supported in the present application at page 4, line 15, where it states "multiresonant section II advantageously lacks such a voluminous and expensive trace capacitor, so in a way the first resonance period thereof is simulated." As such, Applicant points out that the inductor L2 is coupled in series with a current control circuit "without a second trace capacitor coupled therebetween." Thus it is clear that the second S-shaped capacitor of Onozawa is specifically not required in embodiments of the present invention.

Referring now to claim 1, this claim has been amended to make clear that the circuit arrangement comprises "a current control circuit coupled to the inductor without a second trace capacitor coupled therebetween." Since Onozawa does not teach, allude to, or anticipate a circuit that does not include a second trace capacitor (does not include a second S-shaped capacitor) then Applicant respectfully submits that Onozawa does not anticipate claim 1 and therefore respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 are each directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that this § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 7, this claim has also been amended to recite that the circuit arrangement comprises a control circuit coupled to the inductor (L2) "without another trace capacitor connected therebetween." Applicant again submits that Onozawa does not teach or anticipate such circuitry without the requisite trace capacitor (S-shaped capacitor) and therefore requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is dependent upon claim 7 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 7. Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now ready for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: Aug 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Steven R. Greenfield

Steven R. Greenfield

Registration No.: 38,166

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL

CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202